DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 708 EA 024 405

AUTHOR Watts, Gary D.; Castle, Shari
TITLE The Time Dilemma in School Restructuring.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Workload; Program Implementation; Scheduling; *School Restructuring; *Time Management

ABSTRACT

Findings of a study that identified time management strategies used by schools involved in restructuring to address the problem of time are presented in this paper, which is based on the assertion that school faculties need time to restructure while implementing new programs. Methodology involved a survey of 31 schools and 14 school districts that participated in National Center Programs, such as the Mastery In Learning Consortium, the district-based Learning Laboratories Initiative, and the pre-service preparation based Teacher Education Initiative. Five strategies used by educators to find time for restructuring included using freed-up time, restructured or rescheduled time, common time, better-used time, and purchased time. Findings of other studies appear to substantiate the results. Other considerations include addressing both individual and institutional needs, considering the local context, implementing participative decision making, providing a longterm focus, and informing legislators and policymakers about the need for professional time. A copy of the survey is included. (Contains 18 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED350708

The Time Dilemma in School Restructuring

Gary D. Watts
Shari Castle

National Center for Innovation
National Education Association

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Castle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Changing Schools from Within: Tensions and Dilemma in School Restructuring Symposium presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1992

EA 024 405

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Time Dilemma in School Restructuring

> As the "restructuring task person" for our school I have been hit with the reality that not only is it difficult to change paradigms to accept change, but it TAKES TIME. Time for researching, time for discussing, time for assessing, and more . . . There seems to be an overwhelming amount of ideas for change, not only in structure and governance, but also in teaching and learning innovations, technology, and the philosophy of education. Teachers are being asked to "become empowered" and to take on a "more professional role" in education. I'm beginning to wonder how this is going to take place when in reality out time is already "overspent" in teaching, planning, conferencing, etc. I agree with Gene Maeroff's statement that "reform cannot be carried out in the spare time of teachers" if it is to be effective. It seems to me that the "job description" of the teachers has to change from one of a "8:00 to 3:00" teacher to a professional who is given time for collaboration, meeting with other professionals, and professional training and education. Any thoughts? (School Renewal Network, 1991).

> While becoming empowered is exciting and rewarding, I am beginning to wonder if all this "empowerment" is going to lead to expirement. As the chairperson of our site-based management council, I find myself constantly in discourse with parents, students, staff, administration, and teachers from the moment I get out of my car in the morning to leaving school at the end of the day. Then of course there are agendas, details, district memos, etc. to work out. Then as teachers I am still obligated to plan for classes, meet with parents, meet with fellow teachers to plan, and serve on committees, and squeeze teaching time in!!! Ah, but that is not all. Currently our state is reviewing our entire educational system and our department of education is restructuring so there are meetings to testify at and questionnaires to fill out. Need I mention time for family??? It is becoming obvious to me that in order for teachers to be successful at our new responsibilities we are going to need to have the blocks of time that other professionals have to meet and plan (and converse on the Network). It is not enough to say that if you are dedicated and committed you will make time. Obviously since our main objective is student performance our other responsibilities should not restrict us from providing optimum learning environments for our students. And these can not exist if adequate preparation and planning are not there. So, this is where I am. Knee deep in various projects. Maybe other teachers are in a similar position? Maybe we're now in the "process" of change and implementation in our own schools which is taking time away from the broader community of the Network? (School Renewal Network, 1992).

In schools and districts engaged in restructuring and transformation efforts, time is one of the most difficult and troublesome problems for educators. Through our experience with over one hundred experimental restructuring efforts, we have come to recognize that the constraints of time and the resultant frustration places the time concern as one of the fundamental matters of attention.

Time Dilemmas

Society versus schools. One dilemma is that the time problem is external to the school as well as internal. Time pressure is an increasingly common aspect of American culture. "Timelock occurs when demands on our time become so overwhelming that it feels impossible to wring one more second out of crowded schedules and hectic days" (Keyes, 1992). We have too many choices (13,000 new products appeared in supermarkets last year). Time-saving devices do not save us time (blow dryers simply enable us to wash our hair more often). Modern technology has eliminated the "pause" depriving us of chances to catch our breath (when we cooked the chicken in the oven, we had an hour; now we cook the chicken in the microwave for 6 minutes). According to Keyes, the price we pay for timelock is steep in terms of physical conditions, psychological stress, and poor relationships.

Timelock is now a widespread social-culture phenomenon both in and out of schools. Schools, however, have unique cultures, structures, and other factors that pose particular time dilemmas within schools.

Instructional versus non-instructional time. The traditional view of the teacher's work is governed by the idea that time with students is of singular value. This view rests on the instructional premise that teachers are deliverers of content and that curricular and pedagogical planning and decision making rest at higher levels of authority, and that professional development is somehow not related to improving instruction. As an example, the Washington, DC Acting Superintendent, when announcing 4 days of furlough for teachers in order to save money, said the furloughs included one instructional day and three non-instructional days. This directly illustrates the lack of value placed on teacher's non-instructional time. On the other hand, we have a district whose long-range strategic plan calls for teachers to spend 50% of their time teaching students and 50% in professional activities with other adults.

Teachers often experience this dilemma as guilt when they are out of the classroom:

> We have taken substitute days so that committees can meet. We have found that we accomplish a lot at these meetings, yet we still wish that everyone could hear the dialogue that goes on. We always get different points of view since most of the committees have members from across the grade levels. The problem we run into, however, is the feelings of guilt for leaving our classes so often. Last week as we went out for our Steering Committee meeting, my students said, 'Another meeting?' I replied that it had to do with school concerns and some students said, 'don't be so concerned.' I know where they're coming from. I haven't been sick, but I have been out for staff development workshops and committee meetings. In the long run it all will supposedly benefit the students, but what about doing my job which is to teach? I think most teachers have mixed feelings. They want input in things that matter concerning teaching, but they want to be with the students during the school day (School Renewal Network, 1992).

The role of teacher is being redefined to include the teacher as a professional decision maker who is knowledgeable and reflective. If the teacher's role is to change however, the conception of how a teacher's time is organized must change also. As one survey respondent notes:

> Now a teacher spends approximately 80% of his or her time actually with students, either administering instruction or evaluating it. . . . Does that really make sense? In medicine the most important things a doctor does involve diagnosis, prescription, analysis, and adjustment of prescriptions. "Administering" the cure is not a particularly time-consuming activity in relative terms. One reason educators were driven to standardized treatments to non-standardized clients is because there is not time for reflection, consultation, or serious, as opposed to trivial, assessments.

Inflexible versus flexible schedules. A teacher visiting our office for a meeting recently said, "The schedule is GOD. You can do any innovation you want in your classroom as long as you don't mess with the schedule." Traditional, inflexible scheduling is based on administrative and institutional needs. New, more flexible scheduling patterns are based on pedagogical practices, the educational needs of students, and the professional needs of teachers.

Internal versus external control of teachers' time. There is an assumption that teachers--and therefore their time--have to be managed. This thinking grows out of the historically low status of teachers and is related to issues of trust and respect (Hargreaves, 1990). Teachers have not been trusted to use their non-instructional time wisely and have

had virtually no control over the structure of their time or its use. Studies have shown that the managerial model is antithetical to the job of teaching (Hargreaves, 1990; Brown, 1991). ". . . the fact that [time] interacts with all of the other variables which make up the conditions impinging on teaching ensures that to think about it in terms of the simple industrial managerial model is unhelpful" (Brown, p. 5).

The importance of teachers' authentic involvement is now being recognized. Very often in the past, teacher involvement meant soliciting their ideas in order to ensure buy-in on top-down developments. The complexity of change, coupled with evidence that successful change must be driven from the local level, now makes teachers and other site personnel essential participants in any restructuring effort. Bacharach, Shedd, and Conley (1989) write:

> For many years "involvement" was considered something that boards and administrators gave or allowed teachers to have, to improve their morale or to win their support for management initiatives. The most recent wave of reform reports has turned that reasoning on its head, arguing that school systems need the advice and information that their teachers can offer concerning client needs and the educational process. Rather than something that boards and administrators *give to* teachers, involvement in educational policymaking is now being redefined as something that they *get from* teachers (p. 60).

The need for increased involvement puts increasing pressures on faculty members regarding professional time. It calls for a shift in control over time structures to the teachers (Coalition of Essential Schools, 1991).

Differing conceptions of time. Time may be thought of as technical-rational or phenomenological (Hargreaves, 1990). The technical-rational dimension holds time as a finite resource to be managed and organized, while phenomenological time is the subjective experience of lived time. This inner sense of time varies from person to person and is often different from "clock" time.

Another way to conceptualize differences is monochronic verses polychronic conceptions of time (Hall, 1984). Monochronic time frames can be described as: one thing at a time, completion of schedules, low sensitivity to context, control over completion of

schedule, orientation to schedules and procedures, Western cultures, official sphere of business and professions, large organizations, and male (Hargreaves, 1990). Polychronic time frames are described as: doing several things as once, completion of transactions, high sensitivity to context, control over description and evaluation of task, orientation to people and relationships, Amerindian and Latin cultures, unofficial sphere of informality and domestic life, small organizations, and female.

Hargreaves (1990) sees major differences in the conceptualizations and lived experience of time between administrators and teachers. Administrators tend toward technical-rational, monochronic time, while teachers tend toward phenomenological, polychronic time frames. The classroom is polychronic in nature with many things happening at once and multiple variables affecting the need for subtle, minute-by-minute shifts.

> Conflicts and misunderstandings occur when this polychronic culture of female elementary teachers comes into contact with a monochronic culture of male administration which is insensitive to context. This can occur with inflexible implementation plans, for instance. . . . Teacher needs and demands generated from the particularities of the context may obstruct, undermine, or redefine the purposes built into the new administrative procedures and the time designations and allocations which accompany them. In this strained juxtaposition of monochronic and polychronic time frames can be seen much of the reason for the apparent failure of administratively imposed reforms in education (Hargreaves, 1990, p. 311).

Development versus implementation. The separation of external development and internal implementation forces teachers to work according to external timelines rather than the needs of students or the requirements of a successful implementation (Hargreaves, 1990). This leads to "intensification" (Apple, 1986), to an escalation of pressure on the teachers.

Tinkering versus transformation. There is a growing concensus that working at the edges of change will be insufficient to the needs of schools. "Silver bullet" strategies for reforming American education will fail, because the problem is systemic and requires

systemic solutions. We must plan, design, and implement a new conception of learning communities.

One of the time dilemmas involved is that "we're building the airplane while we're in the air." While designing and starting to implement changes, we must keep schools open and functioning well for students. Educators are confronted with the dilemma of maintaining and improving system 'A' while designing and implementing system 'B'. The double effort increases time pressures considerably.

Teacher development versus student empowerment. Over six years ago, the National Education Association initiated the Mastery in Learning Project. That project and the subsequent expanded efforts of the NEA National Center for Innovation have provided extensive opportunities for studying the practicalities of transforming schools. One critical finding is a "theory of action" for school transformation (McClure, 1991). For the past six years, Center schools have charted a progression of change that is not necessarily linear, neat, or discreet, but is a progression nevertheless.

The first phase is "individual affirmation" in which teachers acknowledge to themselves and others that they can make a difference. Individuals begin to discover and acknowledge their talents and strengths. The second phase is the "development of faculty-ness." During this phase, educators begin to believe that their schools can improve, and that they as a faculty are responsible for that improvement. Teachers begin to look to research for information and options, and feel it is okay to take risks. The first two phases of transformation are precursors to the "development of a culture conducive to change." Such a culture is necessary if faculties are to seriously challenge the regularities of the current system and begin testing alternative options.

The relevant point here is that faculty development is necessary to student empowerment, and faculty development takes time. It can not be implemented by edict. Time to collaborate, ponder, dialogue, and reflect with others is essential, but adds to the time pressure. Bird and Little (1986) state, "The most important resource for improvement

is time with colleagues: time for [faculties] to examine, debate and improve their norms of civility, instruction and improvement. Considerably more time for these activities should be made in the normal school day, either by addition or by the elimination of activities that are less important (p. 504).

Statement of the Problem

The primary dilemma is that school faculties need time to restructure WHILE restructuring time. In 1990, external consultants interviewed Learning Lab participants and reported the following to the Center staff (Bundy & Pemberton, 1991):

> 'There's never enough time' is the most frequent single lament offered up by the Learning Lab leaders. The issue is occasionally raised as a problem of not being compensated for time being put in on a task. But far more often, it is simply that the schedule in schools and the demands of one's teaching job do not afford teachers the time necessary to work with one another, to participate in community forums, to seek additional professional development opportunities, etc. The inflexible and outdated calendar and teacher job description is a major obstacle for teachers everywhere in the network. Release time is one option that is in use in several sites. However, the likely longer term effect will be to focus the projects on ensuring that the restructuring means new job descriptions for teachers, more time on planning, less on what one site calls "non-instructional duties." The solution that Labs seem to be coming up with is to finagle as many of the scheduling barriers as possible, to use afterschool time exhaustively, and in the very popular words of the athletic shoe commercial, 'Just do it!' . . . Nevertheless, the time problem remains a barrier to much of the promise of school reform and must be solved in a more lasting and institutional way (p. 11-12).

In response, we sought to find out what schools which are involved in restructuring have done to address the problem of time. What strategies have they developed which address the various time dilemmas and which may be useful to others in similar circumstances?

Method

The National Center for Innovation of the National Education Association has instituted several programmatic efforts in school restructuring. The "parent" initiative was the Mastery In Learning Project begun in 1985. Current program initiatives include the school-based Mastery In Learning Consortium, the district-based Learning Laboratories Initiative, and the pre-service preparation based Teacher Education Initiative. At the time

of data collection, 31 schools and 14 school districts were actively involved in the National Center programs.

Each of the initiative sites was surveyed for the options and strategies they had developed to address the time dilemma (see Appendix A for survey).

The survey responses were grouped and regrouped until broad categories emerged.

All of the current sites are connected through an electronic network that links practitioners and researchers in dialogue about school restructuring. The survey results were supplemented by a search of the electronic network database for additional time strategies.

Time Dilemma Strategies

Five time dilemma strategies emerged as we examined the data from the surveys. These strategies are not mutually exclusive, but they represent five different ways educators facing time dilemmas have attempted to address the very real problem of finding time. The five broad categories are described below with short descriptions of various strategies and techniques being tried by the surveyed schools.

Time Strategy #1: Freed-up Time. Most schools in the study are attempting to free-up teachers' ime from the traditional constraints built into the school calendar, hours of the day, and teaching schedule. This strategy does not attempt to restructure the calendar, school day, or teaching schedule, but rather breaks teachers out of the traditional constraints by various intervention tactics. Generally, these tactics are temporary and ad hoc. Some efforts, however, are being made to institutionalize the various efforts.

Various strategies include:

- Two schools authorize teaching assistants to cover elementary classes at regular intervals so teachers can meet together to plan.
- Several schools indicate that administrators take over teachers classes on occasion to free-up the teachers for planning or special events.

- In several schools, teachers team together, both formally and informally, thus allowing for one teacher to "cover" for another who is freed-up.
- A district in North Dakota regularly schedules an early release for teachers to discuss specific topics of interest. Classes are covered by team members, support staff, and administrators.
- A high school provides two periods of released time for restructuring project coordinators. This arrangement is funded by the district.
- A middle school involved in a joint project with a local college of education uses college interns to cover classes.
- An elementary school uses parent volunteers to provide coverage of classes.
- Another elementary school uses a unique "theme and team teaching" arrangement. On selected Friday afternoons, teachers from three grade-levels plan a combined theme day. Special presentations are prepared using parents, older students, business volunteers, and teachers from one of the three grades. On any specific "theme and team" Friday, the teachers from the other two grade-levels are thus freed up to plan and accomplish other collaborative efforts.
- One high school on the west coast has a collaborative program in Language Arts/Social Studies with a community theater group. Teachers are free to plan and conduct other affairs when the students go to the theater for performances.
- In one vocational school, students develop a plan for an "off site" learning experience. All students plan their experience for the same day. On that day the staff is free to plan.

Time Strategy #2: Restructured or Rescheduled Time. Restructured time involves formally altering the time frame of the traditional calendar, school day, or teaching

schedule This strategy requires more formal involvement of stakeholders, including parents. The surveys indicate the complexity of dealing with practical problems such as bus schedules, but also indicate the increased value of the permanent nature of this strategy.

Schools report the following:

- The most common tactic is to rearrange the daily schedule by adding student time on four days, so that, one day a week the students are released early. This allows teachers to schedule planning and development activities. Such "banking" of time is being used in both elementary and secondary schools.
- One elementary school and one middle school rescheduled the school day to create a first period before students arrive. This results in students staying longer in the afternoon, but provides a common time for the faculty to plan and work while they are fresh in the morning.
- One school district authorized the local sites to rearrange the student day in any option desired between 8:00 am and 4:00 pm.
- One unique schedule for a secondary school involves a parallel block schedule. Classes meet for five periods on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday. On those four days, there are three periods before lunch and two after. On Wednesdays, only four class periods are held and there is no lunch break. Students are dismissed after the 4th class and the faculty have a student-free, 2-hour block of time.

Time Strategy #3: Common Time. Designating specific time periods for individual teachers to prepare and plan has received some attention in elementary and secondary schools. "Prep periods" are certainly not uncommon. However, as the conception of school transformation evolves from what individual teachers do in individual classrooms to the acceptance of the critical need for teacher collaboration and the development of faculty-ness, isolated planning periods are not sufficient. Therefore, many schools in the study are

experimenting with ways to schedule "common" planning time among colleagues with similar assignments.

A large number of schools are scheduling common prep or planning periods. Examples include:

- One middle school has two planning periods shared by team members involved in restructuring programs.
- At another middle school, all interdisciplinary teams have a common planning time.
- In yet another middle school, academic teachers are organized into teams of three or four. Each team has a common planning period.
- In one high school, each individual discipline area has a daily common planning time.
- An elementary school has restructured their schedule for common grade-level planning.

Time Strategy #4: Better-Used Time. Schools now hold regular faculty meetings and have some form of professional development activity. Equally as universal is the disrespect teachers hold toward those meetings and activities. While teachers express the strong desire for more planning time, faculty meetings are generally viewed as wasteful of time. One strategy in many of the restructuring schools is to examine ways of using the currently scheduled meetings and development activities more efficiently, for planning rather than administrative or informational purposes.

Different techniques being tried by the schools in the survey include:

- In one district, teachers are expected to attend seven pre-school workdays in the fall. In the past, much of the time was devoted to central office meetings. Upon review, all central office meetings have been consolidated into one day leaving six days for teacher planning and preparation.

- In one high school, a monthly staff development newsletter is published to update all teachers and other employees. This newsletter omits the need for using faculty meeting time for that purpose.
- One elementary school has initiated a management council which includes restructuring team representatives. The management council handles administrative affairs so that the faculty meetings for all teachers can be spent on more significant issues. Faculty meetings are used for talking, thinking and sharing.
- A middle school uses memos and a teacher bulletin board with daily postings to disseminate information.
- In one district, each faculty member has a computer on their desk. The computers are networked together on a local area network with Email capabilities. Teachers report that Email has significantly increased their ability to communicate with each other, seek help, and share ideas.
- A high school has single-issue faculty meetings moderated by an elected faculty member.
- An elementary school uses pass-and-read folders for disseminating information.
- Team teaching patterns are used in several schools. They report that team teaching projects allow more creativity in scheduling time, sharing, and covering for each other.
- Another high school has structured "schools within a school" groupings of students and teachers providing more flexibility in scheduling time.

Time Strategy #5: Purchased Time. Purchasing additional time appears to be a desirable, yet unrealistic time strategy. Obviously, with sufficient funds, additional teachers can be hired, class size reduced, and planning periods increased. This raises the issue of

priority. As previously mentioned, one district has accepted the goal of fifty percent teacher contract time devoted to planning and other development activities.

Of interest in this paper is the number of creative ways of purchasing time within the current funding constraints. The tactics described include:

- One school has established a "substitute bank" of 30 to 40 days per year. Teachers can use the substitute days for committee work, special professional development activities, and other development projects. The sub-days may be either half- or full-day.
- One elementary school has received a grant from a foundation which pays for early release time for the faculty one day a month.
- In one school district, staff development funds can be used to buy planning time in the summer by paying teachers stipends.
- Several schools use staff development funds to pay for half- or full-day mini-retreats.
- In two districts, the bargaining agreement provides for extra-duty pay or compensation for evenings and summers for planning activities.
- In one project school, two teachers who are heavily involved in restructuring efforts share one teaching assignment between them.
- Another school received a grant from a foundation which was used to buy substitute time to free teachers engaged in restructuring efforts.
- In an elementary school, teachers developing new programs on their own time receive "in-service" credits from the district for their work.

Conclusions

Strategies. Other studies have looked at time strategies and their findings complement ours. An action research project presented at the First International Symposium on Action Research (Baker, 1990) found the following trends in use: waiver of student contact time, district early dismissal, banking time, using specialists' schedules,

buying substitutes, and drop scheduling. Campbell (1985) identified four kinds of non-instructional time: group time, personal time, snatched time, and preparation time. The Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools (1992) reported the following options: new opportunities through grants and staff development, creative scheduling, substitute teaching by administrators and colleagues, and making time productive by defining a mission, articulating goals, grouping teachers, training for collaborative skills, and using agendas and reports. One report describes not only the result, but a process-based model for finding planning time (Jacokes, 1990).

The survey identified numerous successful efforts in dealing with the time dilemma. Still, many of these efforts are only working at the edges of the problem. These strategies are presented as helping with, but not necessarily solving the problem. In the surveys one teacher stated:

> The problem is not solved by any means. The majority of time needed for commitment to improvement comes out of teachers' lives. School systems are providing some time, but the commitment of the individual teacher is the highest cost of school reform.

Considerations. In addition to strategies, the literature and our data suggest several important considerations when dealing with the time issue:

- Attention must be given to both individual and institutional needs (Coalition of Essential Schools, 1991);
- Sensitivity to the local context is critical (Jacokes, 1990; Hargreaves, 1989);
- All stakeholders must be involved in the decision making (Jacokes, 1990);
- There must be a movement from "presentism" to overall long-term concerns (Hargreaves, 1989);
- We must impress upon legislators and policy makers the need for professional time (Coalition for Essential Schools, 1991);

- Use your vision, mission, and goals to prioritize and focus the use of time (Center for Organization and Restructuring Schools, 1992);
- Decelerate, accomplish more by doing less, and accept that you can't do it all (Keyes, 1992).

One of the researchers on the School Renewal Network writes:

> I've been following the conversations about the time it takes to do the hard work of restructuring schools and the cumbersome nature of the process as it begins. I'm moved to enter the conversation with three research-derived conclusions about significant school change. First, change is ALWAYS extraordinarily time-consuming as people learn new ways of thinking and acting, test out the new habits of mind, and reflect upon what the hell is happening as a consequence of them. Second, the concept of "mutual adaptation" (Berman & McLaughlin's Rand Study of Educational Innovations) needs to be considered in that what is introduced as change will surely be altered over time as the object (i.e., school decision making) changing form and meaning. Third, DDAE (Bentzen's wonderful book "Changing Schools: The Magic Feather Principle") has been found to be associated with successful change. The acronym stands for Dialogue (focussed, not rambling), Decision making (decisions to change that emerge from the dialogue), Action (activities, processes, events that conform to the decisions), and Evaluation (reflecting on the consequences of the action). Although seldom found in "pure" form (there's a lot of fuzziness around the edges) this sequence of steps can be helpful to monitor how we're spending our time and to what ends the time is spent (School Renewal Network, 1989).

If teachers are given a stronger voice in time planning at the school level, might this give rise to more realistic, sensitive timelines for implementation and improvement (Hargreaves, 1990)? Might it also improve quality of worklife conditions and increase teacher professionalism (Louis and Smith, 1990)?

More time is necessary, but not sufficient (Hargreaves, 1990; Handal, 1991). Equally important is how the time is to be used , and who is in control of its use:

> The solution . . . is to explore solutions which question the strength of the divisions between administration and teaching, between development and implementation, and which question the bureaucratic impulses that support such divisions. In particular, I suspect it would be more helpful to give more responsibility and flexibility to teachers in the management and allocation of their time and to offer them more control over what is to be developed within that time. In doing this, we would be recognizing that teacher development ultimately is incompatible with the confinement of teachers to the role of merely implementing curriculum guidelines. . . . Once we acknowledge what time means for the teachers, there seems to be a strong case for giving time back to the teacher both quantitatively and

> qualitatively and for giving the teacher educationally substantial things to do with that time (Hargreaves, 1990, p. 319).

Our further research will look with more depth and specificity at how faculties resolved (or did not resolve) particular dilemmas within their specific contexts.

References

Apple, M. W. (1986). Teachers and texts. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bacharach, S. B., Shedd, J. B., & Conley, S. C. (1989). School management and teacher unions: The capacity for cooperation in an age of reform. In B. Dennis (Ed). Forty-first Annual Proceedings of the Industrial Relations Research Association (pp. 60-69). Madison, WI: Industrial Relations Research Association.

Baker, J., Bratigan, N., McElliot, K., & Withrow, J. (1990). How schools create time. Paper presented at the First International Symposium on Action Research, Vancouver, WA.

Bird, T., & Little, J. W. (1986). How schools organize the teaching profession. Elementary School Journal, 86(4), 493-511.

Brown, S. (1991). The role of time in teachers' perceptions of their own teaching. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Bundy, A. L., & Pemberton, D. P. (1991). Strategic development plan for the NEA National Center for Innovation and the Learning Labs Initiative. [Report]. Washington, DC: NEA National Center for Innovation.

Campbell, R. J. (1985). Developing the primary curriculum. Eastbourne: Cassells.

Center on Organization and Restructuring Schools. (1992). Collaborative planning time for teachers. Brief to principals. No. 2. Madison, WI: Author.

Coalition of Essential Schools. (1991) Resistant teachers as a force for change. Horace, 7(3), 11-12.

Hall, E. T. (1984). The dance of life. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Handal, G. (1991). Collective time--collective practice? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Hargreaves, A. (1989). Cultures of teaching: Part II. OPSTF News, 3(4), 20-23.

Hargreaves, A. (1990). Teachers' work and the politics of time and space. Qualitative Studies in Education, 3(4), 303-320.

Jacokes, L. E. (1990). Finding planning time for school improvement activities: A manual. Wyoming, MI: Wyoming Public Schools.

Keyes, R. (1992). Do you have time? Parade Magazine, February 16, pp. 22-25.

Louis, K. S., & Smith. (1990). Teacher working conditions. In P. Ryes, Teachers and their workplace (pp. 23-47). Newbury Park: SAGE.

McClure, R. M. (1991). From reform to transformation. Doubts & Certainties: The Newsletter of the NEA National Center for Innovation, 6(3), 4-5.

School Renewal Network. (1989-1992). [Transcripts of Network dialogue]. Washington, DC: NEA National Center for Innovation.

Appendix A: Survey

Scanning Survey
OPTIONS FOR CREATING TIME
NEA National Center for Innovation

School or District _____

Respondent_____

RETURN BY Friday, APRIL 26.

Research makes it clear that changes in schools will be lasting and effective only if they are made with the significant involvement of teachers. Teachers must therefore be at the heart of school reform activities. One of the key reforms is to create in the school day of teachers, the opportunity to engage in the planning, collaboration, and decision making work required to make changes. The dilemma? How do faculties plan for the reorganization of their days when, until those days are reorganized, they have no time in which to do it?

How has your faculty dealt with this dilemma? What strategies have you used to accommodate the time dilemma? What options have you developed? How have you created more time? How have you refocused energies? How have you shared the workload?

Please list below (RIGHT NOW!) all the ways your faculty/district has attempted to address the time dilemma. You may use short, bulletted, incomplete sentences (e.g., we post announcements rather than make them at meetings; or one school in the district reorganized the schedule to enable common planning time). Use additional pages as necessary.